

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

EINTTED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Gnited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virgnia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                      | FILING DA  | ATE        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/605,301                           | 09/22/2003 |            | Darrell Snell        |                     | 2300             |  |
| 75                                   | 90 0       | 06/07/2005 | •                    | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| Steven Roberts<br>6-1-507 Kamiyamada |            |            |                      | HRUSKOCI, PETER A   |                  |  |
|                                      | 565-0872   |            |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| JAPAN                                |            |            |                      | 1724                | <del></del> -    |  |

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)                                    |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | 10/605,301   | SNELL ET AL.                                    |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Peter A. Hruskoci  | 1724  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address<br>Period for Reply  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2005.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | action is non-final.   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. |   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9)☑ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  |  | (PTO-413)<br>Ite<br>atent Application (PTO-152) |  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date  | 6)  Other:   |   |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/605,301

Art Unit: 1724

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the specification paragraph [0019], "isa", and paragraph [0022] "(dimethylinino)" and "polydimethyliallyl" are erroneous and should be changed to – is a -, - (dimethylimino) -, and – polydimethylallyl -, respectively.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 4 "(dimethylinino)" and "polydimethyliallyl" are erroneous and should be changed to – is a -, - (dimethylimino) -, and – polydimethylallyl -, respectively.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Noda et al. 4,710,298. It is submitted that Noda et al. (see col. 1 line 24 through col. 8 line 42) disclose the filter aid or auxiliary comprised of a cellulosic material and cationic polymer flocculating agent as recited in the instant claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noda et al. as above, and further in view of Koslow 2003/0168401 or Strominger et al. 5,284,634. The claim differs from Noda et al. as applied above, by reciting that the filter aid includes a specific group of cationic amine or imine salt polymer. Koslow disclose (see page 4) and Strominger et al. (see col. 3 line 9 through col. 5 line 59) that it is known in the art to utilize diallyldimethylammonium chloride in combination with cellulose fibers or filter aids, to aid filtration of aqueous liquids. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the filter aid or auxiliary of Noda et al. by including the recited cationic amine salt polymer in view of the teachings of Koslow or Strominger et al., to aid in filtering aqueous liquids.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3 and 5 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of copending Application No. 10/904,219. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims appear to be fully encompassed by claims 1-3 of the copending application, respectively.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-5 in the reply filed on 5/9/05 is acknowledged. The restriction requirement is made final.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (571) 272-1160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peter A. Hruskoci Primary Examiner Art Unit 1724